

Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/017,213	12/14/2001	Scott R. Smith	S13.12-0111	1208	
7590 06/15/2004			EXAM	INER	
Joseph R. Kelly			MANTIS MERCADER, ELENI M		
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY International Centre - Suite 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
900 South Second Avenue			3737		

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				$-\nabla$
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	Ŋ
		10/017,213	SMITH, SCOTT R.	(
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Eleni Mantis Mercader	3737	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
	or Reply	NIVIO CETTO EVEIDE AMO	NITU(C) EDOM	
THE - External control	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a roperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the managed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repreply within the statutory minimum of thirty of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI tute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communi NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.
Status	×			
1)[7]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on $3\underline{h}$	alar.		
2a)⊠	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	his action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allow		rs, prosecution as to the meri	its is
,—	closed in accordance with the practice unde			
Disposit	tion of Claims			
4) 🖾	Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application	on.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd			
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-85</u> is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Applicat	tion Papers			
, —	The specification is objected to by the Exam			
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on 3/29/2004 is/are: a)			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to t			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-15	02.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume			
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p		eceived in this National Stag	е
	application from the International Bur			
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a l	list of the certified copies not r	eceived.	
Attachme	nt(s)	_		
	ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
3) 🔯 Info	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ er No(s)/Mail Date 3/2 <u>9/04</u> .		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	1

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 3/29/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the increased SNR is not the same motivation of using the image while reanalyzing a vessel, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See Ex parte Obiaya, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Also, the last sentence of the rejection states that it is well known to skilled artisans that rf coils are capable of performing the functions of ablation, imaging and tracking, therefore as long as there was a motivation to combine the primary reference of a tracking rf coil in a treating catheter with the rf coil for imaging internal structures, then the rejection is valid. In case, the applicant wanted to challenge the official notice taken by the Examiner, the Examiner currently provides the teaching of Halperin et al. '176 which clearly states that the rf antenna can be used for internal imaging and ablation (see col. 4, lines 1-21). Therefore, the 103 rejection is maintained. Also, note that the amendment to the claim "from within the vessel" does not limit in anyway the claim as even if an external coil was used to take an image of the occluded vessel, the MRI image would indicate the occlusion from within the vessel and the vessel itself and its surrounding area.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Application/Control Number: 10/017,213

Art Unit: 3737

51

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumoulin et al.'896 in view of Minkoff'461 (PCT), both of record and Halperin et al.'176.

Dumoulin et al. '896 teach all the features of the instant invention including a tracking NMR coil for providing positional information of the surgical catheter of interest and which also delivers RF current to treat the area of interest, while the MRI system acquires image data of the area of interest which depicts on the MRI image the location of the tracking coil (see claim 1 of Dumoulin et al. '896).

Dumoulin et al.'896 does not teach the use of the tracking NMR coil which provides a first image of the patient's internal area of interest used to enhance the acquired MRI image as acquired by the MRI system, and providing this enhanced image by combining the internal with the externally derived MRI image.

In the same field of endeavor, Minkoff 461 (PCT) teaches the use of an internally derived image of the proximate area of interest near the catheter being combinable with an externally derived MRI image in order to combine the two and provide an enhanced image (see abstract and see in page 5, lines 22-31).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to have modified Dumoulin et al.'896 and incorporated the teaching of Minkoff'461 (PCT), by using the internal tracking coil to obtain an image of the internal area of interest wherein the operation of interest occurs, such as a procedure of recanalization, and combine that image with the externally derived image in order to increase the S/N ratio of the MRI image by combining the internal and externally derived images as taught by Minkoff'461 (PCT) (see for

Art Unit: 3737

motivation to combine page 5, lines 29-31). It is well known to skilled artisans that rf coils can perform all three functions of ablation, imaging and tracking. See Halperin et al.'176 which clearly states that the rf antenna can be used for internal imaging and ablation (see col. 4, lines 1-21) meaning that an rf antenna is capable of both imaging of internal structures and of ablation.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3737

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni Mantis Mercader whose telephone number is 703 308-0899. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri., 8:00 a.m.-6:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on (703) 308-5181. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Eleni Mantis Mercader **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 3737